

Comment

Comment on “Critique and correction of the currently accepted solution of the infinite spherical well in quantum mechanics” by Huang Young-Sea and Thomann Hans-Rudolph

ANTONIO PRADOS¹ and CARLOS A. PLATA¹

¹ Física Teórica, Universidad de Sevilla, Apartado de Correos 1065, E-41080 Sevilla, Spain

PACS 03.65.-w – Quantum mechanics

PACS 03.65.Ta – Foundations of quantum mechanics; measurement theory

In a recent paper [1], Huang and Thomann criticise the “traditional” solution of the time-independent Schrödinger equation for a particle of mass μ in an infinite spherical well,

$$H\psi(\mathbf{r}) \equiv \left[-\frac{\hbar^2}{2\mu} \nabla^2 + V(r) \right] \psi(\mathbf{r}) = E\psi(\mathbf{r}), \quad (1)$$

where $V(r) = 0$ for $r \leq a$, $V(r) = \infty$ for $r > a$. The wave function, as usual, is written in spherical coordinates as $\psi_{klm}(\mathbf{r}) = R_{kl}(r)Y_l^m(\theta, \phi)$, where $R_{kl}(r)$ and $Y_l^m(\theta, \phi)$ are the radial part of the wave function and the spherical harmonics, respectively. Then, $\chi_{kl}(r) \equiv rR_{kl}(r)$ satisfies

$$\frac{d^2 \chi_{kl}}{dr^2} + \left[k^2 - \frac{2\mu V(r)}{\hbar^2} - \frac{l(l+1)}{r^2} \right] \chi_{kl} = 0, \quad (2)$$

in which $k = \sqrt{2\mu E}/\hbar$.

Their criticism may be summarised as follows: Since the particle is confined to the spherical well, the region outside is irrelevant and the Schrödinger equation is solved inside the well, that is, in the region $\mathcal{B}_a \equiv \{\mathbf{r} \in \mathbb{R}^3 | 0 \leq r \leq a\}$ where $V(r) = 0$. Consistently, the derivatives of the wave function are treated by one-sided limits at the boundaries. Equation (2) has two linearly independent solutions $rj_l(kr)$ and $rn_l(kr)$, being j_l and n_l the spherical Bessel and Neumann functions, respectively. Firstly, for $l > 0$, $rn_l(kr)$ is not square-integrable, and thus the only acceptable solution is $j_l(kr)$. Secondly, for $l = 0$, $rn_0(kr)$ cannot be disregarded, as it is usually done, because $rn_0(kr) = -\cos(kr)$ is a square-integrable function in the interval $0 \leq r \leq a$. Thirdly, any two solutions of

(2) must verify the relation¹

$$\chi_{kl}^*(r) \frac{d\chi_{k'l}(r)}{dr} - \frac{d\chi_{kl}^*(r)}{dr} \chi_{k'l}(r) \Big|_0^a = 0, \quad (3)$$

which holds for any (k, k', l) and stems from imposing that $\langle \psi_{klm} | H | \psi_{k'l'm'} \rangle = \langle \psi_{k'l'm'} | H | \psi_{klm} \rangle^*$.

Huang and Thomann show that (3) is compatible with the eigenfunction $\chi_{k0}(r) = rn_0(kr)$ and calculate new energy levels and stationary states corresponding to the “conventional” boundary condition $\chi_{kl}(a) = 0$. Furthermore, they conclude by stating that (i) at the edge of the wall, $\chi_{kl}(a) = 0$ is not the only possible boundary condition² and (ii) thus a major open problem is to find the correct boundary condition by sound physical arguments.

In the following, we revisit this quantum mechanical problem and show that the “traditional” solution is indeed the right one, although some care is needed when deriving it if the wave function is restricted to the region $\mathcal{B}_a$, as it is done in [1]. In order to prove this, we make use of (i) the hermiticity of the operator representing the radial component of the linear momentum, that is,

$$p_r = \frac{1}{2} \left(\mathbf{p} \cdot \frac{\mathbf{r}}{r} + \frac{\mathbf{r}}{r} \cdot \mathbf{p} \right) = -i\hbar \left(\frac{\partial}{\partial r} + \frac{1}{r} \right), \quad (4)$$

and (ii) the fact that $\psi_{klm}(\mathbf{r})$ must be a solution of the Schrödinger equation in the considered region, *including the origin* $\mathbf{r} = \mathbf{0} \in \mathcal{B}_a$. Our proof follows the line of reasoning in [2] to derive the boundary condition $\chi_{kl}(0) = 0$ for a particle moving in a central potential, but with the (new) restriction of considering the wave function defined only in the region $\mathcal{B}_a$.

¹Equation (15) in Ref. [1].

²Remember that the wave function is only defined inside $\mathcal{B}_a$, and thus the usual continuity arguments at $r = a$ cannot be applied.

It is straightforward to show, integrating by parts in the interval $0 \leq r \leq a$, that

$$\langle \psi_{klm} | p_r | \psi_{k'l'm'} \rangle = \langle \psi_{k'l'm'} | p_r | \psi_{klm} \rangle^* - i\hbar \chi_{kl}^*(r) \chi_{k'l}(r) \Big|_0^a \delta_{ll'} \delta_{mm'}. \quad (5)$$

Particularisation of (5) for $k = k'$, $l = l'$, $m = m'$ gives

$$|\chi_{kl}(0)| = |\chi_{kl}(a)|, \quad \forall(k, l). \quad (6)$$

This is the main conclusion stemming from the hermiticity of p_r .

Note that, for $l > 0$, (6) makes it possible to derive the only correct boundary conditions for $r = 0$ and $r = a$. Taking into account that the Neumann functions cannot be used because they lead to non-normalisable wave functions, $\chi_{kl}(r) = r j_l(kr)$. Then, $\chi_{kl}(0) = \lim_{r \rightarrow 0} r j_l(kr) = 0$, and then

$$\chi_{kl}(0) = \chi_{kl}(a) = 0, \quad \forall(k, l > 0). \quad (7)$$

The case $l = 0$ must be treated with greater care: we impose that the wave function must be a solution of the Schrödinger equation in $\mathcal{B}_a$. We show below that this excludes radial wave functions $R_{k0}(r)$ behaving as r^{-1} for $r \rightarrow 0$. Solving (2) gives

$$\begin{aligned} R_{k0}(r) &= \frac{A \sin(kr) + B \cos(kr)}{r} \\ &= \frac{B}{r} + \frac{A \sin(kr) + B [\cos(kr) - 1]}{r}, \end{aligned} \quad (8)$$

where A and B are arbitrary constants. The second term on the rhs of (8) is regular at the origin, and no problem stems from the application of the Laplacian operator thereto. On the contrary, the first term is singular, in fact $\nabla^2(1/r) = -4\pi\delta(\mathbf{r})$, where $\delta(\mathbf{r})$ is the Dirac delta function. This implies that

$$\nabla^2 \psi_{k00}(\mathbf{r}) = -k^2 \psi_{k00}(\mathbf{r}) - B(4\pi)^{1/2} \delta(\mathbf{r}), \quad (9)$$

where we have taken into account that $\psi_{k00}(\mathbf{r}) = R_{k0}(r) Y_0^0$, and $Y_0^0 = (4\pi)^{-1/2}$. Therefore, it is in order to have that $\psi_{k00}(\mathbf{r})$ solves the Schrödinger equation in $\mathcal{B}_a$, *including the origin*, that one must impose $B = 0$. Note that there is no delta contribution in the Schrödinger equation (1).

The discussion in the above paragraph precludes $1/r$ terms in the solutions of the Schrödinger equation in $\mathcal{B}_a$. Thus, we have that the only acceptable solution for the $l = 0$ radial function in the spherical well is

$$R_{k0}(r) = A \frac{\sin(kr)}{r}, \quad (10)$$

which implies that $\chi_{k0}(0) = \lim_{r \rightarrow 0} r R_{k0}(r) = 0$. Once more, making use of (6) one obtains

$$\chi_{k0}(0) = \chi_{k0}(a) = 0, \quad \forall k. \quad (11)$$

Therefore, the main conclusion of our analysis for the spherical well reads

$$\chi_{kl}(0) = \chi_{kl}(a) = 0, \quad \forall(k, l). \quad (12)$$

This means that the only physically sound boundary conditions are the “conventional” ones. Moreover, (3) is always fulfilled.

The above result can be extended to quite general spherically symmetric potentials. A key point is that (6) does not use the specific r -dependence of $V(r)$. Let us assume that a particle is restricted to move inside $\mathcal{B}_a$ under a potential $V(r)$ that is bounded therein, except possibly at $r = 0$, where it may diverge as fast as r^{-1} , and $r = a$. Therefore, for $l > 0$, (7) remains valid because the asymptotics for small r of the wave function is dominated by the “centrifugal” contribution $l(l+1)/r^2$ and thus is equal to the $V(r) = 0$ case considered here. Having shown that $\chi_{kl}(0) = 0$, $\chi_{kl}(a) = 0$ follows directly from (6). Also, our conclusion regarding the boundary conditions for $l = 0$ still holds. Specifically, near the origin, a Frobenius series expansion of the radial equation shows that $\psi_{k00}(\mathbf{r}) \sim (c_1 + c_2 r^{-1}) Y_0^0$ and thus $\nabla^2 \psi_{k00}(\mathbf{r}) \sim -(4\pi)^{1/2} c_2 \delta(\mathbf{r})$ if $c_2 \neq 0$. This enforces $c_2 = 0$ in order to make it possible for $\psi_{k00}(\mathbf{r})$ to solve the Schrödinger equation. Then, $\chi_{k0}(0) = \lim_{r \rightarrow 0} r c_1 = 0$ and, again, (6) yields $\chi_{k0}(a) = 0$.

Restricting the physical problem to a finite region instead of the whole space entails that boundary conditions have to be treated carefully. Nevertheless, our result (12) shows that the “conventional” boundary conditions are the correct ones not only for the infinite spherical well but also for quite general three-dimensional spherically symmetric potentials, diverging at most as r^{-1} for $r \rightarrow 0$. Therein, the energy eigenvalues and stationary states are the “traditional” ones found in textbooks [2, 3] and there is no room for novel solutions of the Schrödinger equation.

We acknowledge the support of the Spanish Ministerio de Economía y Competitividad through grant FIS2014-53808-P. Carlos A. Plata also acknowledges the support from the FPU Fellowship Programme of the Spanish Ministerio de Educación, Cultura y Deporte through grant FPU14/00241.

References

- [1] HUANG YOUNG-SEA and THOMANN HANS-RUDOLF, *EPL*, **115** (2016) 60001.
- [2] MESSIAH ALBERT, *Quantum Mechanics*, Vol. 1 (North-Holland, Amsterdam) 1961, p. 346-352.
- [3] GRIFFITHS DAVID J., *Introduction to Quantum Mechanics*, 2nd edition (Pearson Prentice Hall, New Jersey) 2005.